UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/642,615	08/19/2003	Ali Afzali-Ardakani	YOR920030023US1	3761	
	7590 03/03/200 ELLECTUAL PROPEI	EXAMINER			
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200			GAKH, YELENA G		
VIENNA, VA 2	22182-3817		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1797		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			03/03/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/642,615	AFZALI-ARDAKANI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Yelena G. Gakh, Ph.D.	1797		

	Yelena G. Gakh, Ph.D.	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If both is checked, check either box (a) or (1) the period for the	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	Callea
a) ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	-	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	,	II	TOL 004)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		Sanata (Claudiana and Anna)	. (
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Yelena G. Gakh/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1797	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the examiner disagrees with the Applicants' remarks that the amendment does not raise new issues. Claim 14, contrary to the Applicants' remarks, does not recite the limitation of the newly amended claim 1, in particular, "a central fragment of said light-senstive compound between said two arms, which comprises a moiety ...". The language of claim 14 did not contain recitation of the central fragment.

Continuation of 13. Other: in response to the Applicants' remarks that the rejection of the pending claims under 112, first paragraph, was withdrawn by the Notice of Panel Decision, the examiner would like to express once more, that withdrawing rejections established in the previous Office action is a formal act for re-opening the prosecution of the case. It has nothing to do with the panel's decision to withdraw rejection because the rejection did not have the grounds. In the instant case the panel decided to re-open the prosecution of the application, because it has been established that besides rejections under 112, first paragraph, it would be possible to establish rejections over the prior art, which was done in the following Office action. The examiner established rejections under 112, first paragraph, properly using all criteria for this type of rejections, and the panel did not find anything wrong with the rejections. The statement that "the application remains under appeal because there is at least one actual issue for appeal" is used when the rejection remains unchanged. The panel established that there were at least two issues, which required re-opening of the application. The examiner is a member of the panel and is responsible for what she is putting in writing. The examiner respectfully requests the Applicants to provide a paragraph from MPEP, which requires the panel to meet again for repeating decision that was clearly indicated in its first meeting: the rejections are withdrawn and the prosecution is re-opened. Again, the examiner would like to repeat the rule, according to which re-opening the case automatically results in withdrawing the previous rejection. It does not mean that the rejection cannot be re-established with the new rejection added. The Appellants respectfully requests to properly respond to the rejections established by the examiner.